DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 506 EC 180 242

AUTHOR	Gaylord-Ross, Robert J.; And Others
TITLE	The Training and Generalization of Social Interaction Skills with Autistic Youth.
INSTITUTION	Marin County Office of Education, San Rafael, CA.; San Francisco State Univ., Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 84
GRANT	G008104154
NOTE	55p.; In its: The Socialization Research Project. Final Report, Appendix C, August 1984 (EC 180 236).
AVAILABLE FROM	Thomas Haring, Department of Special Education, University of California-Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Autism; Generalization; *Interaction; *Interpersonal Competence; Peer Relationship; Young Adults

ABSTRACT

Two experiments were conducted to increase the initiations and durations of social interactions between autistic and nonhandicapped youths. Experiment 1 involved teaching two autistic youths (17-20 years old) to initiate and elaborate social interactions with three age appropriate and commonly used leisure objects; a radio, a video game, and gum. The students were first taught to use the objects and subsequently instructed in the related social skills. The youths generalized these social responses to other nonhandicapped peers in the same leisure setting. A second experiment trained a third autistic youth (18 years old) to emit similar social leisure skills. The use of the leisure objects and the related social skills were taught at the same time. The autistic youth learned these skills and generalized them to other nonhandicapped peers in the same leisure setting. The importance of teaching generalized social responding in particular subenvironments was emphasized. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED259506

The Training and Generalization of Social Interaction Skills with Autistic Youth*

Robert J. Gaylord-Ross, Thomas G. Haring,
Catherine Breen and Valerie Pitts-Conway

San Francisco State University
and
Marin County Office of Education

Running Head: Social Interaction with Autistic Youth

*The research was supported by a Field Initiated Research Grant, #G008104154, Special Education Program, U.S. Department of Education. The authors would like to thank Drs. Edward Brennan and Steven Collins for their administrative support throughout the project. Requests for reprints can be sent to: Robert Gaylord-Ross, Special Education Department, San Francisco State University, 1600 Holloway Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94132.

EC180242

Abstract

Two experiments were conducted in order to increase the initiations and duration of social interactions between autistic and nonhandicapped youths. Experiment 1 taught two autistic youth to initiate and elaborate social interactions with three age-appropriate and commonly used leisure objects; a radio, a video game and gum. The students were first taught to use the objects and subsequently instructed in the related social skills. The youths generalized these social responses to other nonhandicapped peers in the same leisure setting. A second experiment trained a third autistic youth to emit similar social leisure skills. The use of the leisure objects and the related social skills were taught at the same time. The autistic youth learned these skills and generalized them to other nonhandicapped peers in the same leisure setting. The importance of teaching generalized social responding in particular subenvironments was emphasized.

The Training and Generalization of Social Interaction Skills with Autistic Youth

The term autism denotes a withdrawal from social interaction with other persons. Individuals diagnosed as autistic display an array of behavioral pathologies such as self-injury, overselective attention and self-stimulation that theoretically are manifestations of the underlying condition of extreme self-directedness. The thrust of past educational and research efforts has been to develop interventions that remediate the behavioral excesses and skill deficits so common among autistic persons. An initial tactic has been to reduce aberrant behavior--like aggression and self-stimulation--through behavior management procedures (Koegel & Covert, 1972). With deviant behavior under control, interventions have been applied to remediate language deficits (Lovaas, 1977) and to teach a number of skills in the areas of self-care, perceptual development (Schreibman, Koegel & Craig, 1977) and vocational education (Bellamy, Horner & Inman, 1979).

Interestingly, there has been relatively little research that directly investigates the social development of autistic persons. This is ironic since the central defining feature of autism is extreme social withdrawal. Previous work related to social development includes a study by Koegel and Rincover (1974) which taught autistic children to function effectively in a group of autistic students. Initially, the students were only capable of working in an individualized (one-to-one) instructional context. Egel, Richman and Koegel (1981) demonstrated that autistic

students can imitate their nonhandicapped peers in order to learn a number of tasks. In a study more directly related to social interaction, Strain, Kerr and Ragland (1979) showed that peers can be trained to induce autistic students to interact with them in a free play setting. There is a larger research literature dealing with social skill training which has been primarily carried out with mentally retarded and behavior disordered children (cf., Strain & Fox, 1981). In these studies a normal peer was trained how to prompt and reinforce the behavior of a socially withdrawn child. The studies were successful since the normal peer became an effective instructor and the withdrawn child learned to emit a number of social play behaviors.

The bulk of past work on social training has taken place with preschool children (Guralnick, 1978). There are substantive and practical reasons for this development. Most importantly, the differences in social and cognitive abilities between handicapped and nonhandicapped preschoolers are proportionately less than their counterparts at the elementary and secondary school levels. In addition, university researchers have found easy access to laboratory preschools. Consequently, few procedures have been developed to teach social skills to secondary aged handicapped students. The present study examines social skill development between adolescent autistic and nonhandicapped students in a high school setting.

The prevailing tactic of past efforts has been to train a nonhandicapped peer to be the primary agent of social behavior change (Strain & Fox, 1981). A complementary strategy taken in the present study is to directly train the autistic student to

initiate and elaborate interactions with their nonhandicapped peers. A complete social exchange can be broken down into initiation, elaboration and termination phases. Of these three components, the initiation phase has been the most thoroughly analyzed (Haring, 1978; Stokes, Baer & Jackson, 1974). Unfortunately, the training of initiation responses such as "Hi" and gestural waves tends to result in exchanges lasting for only a few seconds. There is a need to develop training packages that focus on the elaboration phase in order to promote longer duration exchanges. Most elaborations among normal persons tend to be conversational in nature. Because autistic persons characteristically have limited language repertoires, there is an inherent problem in relying on verbal discourse for elaborated encounters. The present study therefore selected nonverbal activities that could be used as a means to promote elaborated social encounters. The activities were of a social leisure variety. They were selected so that they would be reinforcing to both the autistic and the nonhandicapped student. The judicious selection of play materials has been shown to be an important precursor to cooperative or isolate play (Hendrickson, Strain, Tremblay & Shores, 1981; Quilitch & Risley, 1973).

The few studies using autistic students have been successful in training the acquisition of social skills in a specific setting (Ragland, Kerr & Strain, 1978; Strain et al., 1979). These same studies have been unsuccessful in promoting the generalization of social responses to different settings and persons. In explaining the appearance of generalized social responding in other populations, Strain, Shores and Timm (1977) pointed to the

importance of imitation skills, verbal abilities and the presence of effective reinforcers in the target environment. The absence of these properties may preclude the generalization of social skills by autistic persons. The present study applied a "simultaneous" training procedure (Stokes & Baer, 1977) to promote generalization. Most social skill training studies in the past have used the dyadic model of exposing one withdrawn child to one normal peer. The present investigation simultaneously trained the autistic student with multiple exemplars (peers) in order to foster social initiations and elaborations with other students.

EXPERIMENT 1

Method

Two youths attending a class for autistic and severely handicapped students participated in the experiment. Both participants were diagnosed as autistic by an independent agency.

Mike was a 20-year-old who was characterized as socially withdrawn. During the previous two years he averaged five aggressive acts per year involving striking himself and others. He engaged in a high rate of self-stimulatory and inappropriate behaviors which included: humming, singing, facial grimacing, head jerking, patting women on the face and buttocks, hitting his finger tips against flat surfaces and stealing food and other objects. Mike had an expressive vocabulary of about 100 words. He could appropriately request: food items, the use of the bathroom and the desire to play tennis. Typically, however, he would state words out of context in a self-stimulatory manner. He could follow two- and three-step commands.

Mike was capable to performing a number of functional tasks for periods ranging from 15-30 min. He successfully held a work study job at his high school which required him to wash dishes and bus tables. He independently performed all basi self-care behaviors like toileting and dressing.

His social withdrawal consisted of several behavioral patterns. He rarely initiated verbal or nonverbal social interactions. He would respond "hi" to the greetings of others but he did not display spontaneous greeting behaviors. Upon approach by nonhandicapped or handicapped peers he would avoid eye contact and maintain a considerable distance from the other person. He would engage in leisure activities with others only when prompted to do so.

Mike functioned at the severely mentally retarded level of intelligence. Estimates made by psychologists of his intelligence quotient placed him in the 35-45 range.

Dan was a 17-year-old who displayed a number of aberrant behaviors that included: hand-biting, breaking objects, hitting peers and staff and loud vocalizations. He would appropriately request food, records and trips to stores. Dan was capable of a wide variety of independent tasks including: self-care skills, riding public transit, cooking simple meals and cleaning the teacher's lounge.

Dan's social withdrawal was manifested by his ignoring of handicapped and non-handicapped students. During his free time with peers, Dan typically ran through the crowd of people until he found an open area. He would then jump up and down and loudly vocalize to himself. He would respond "hi" to the greetings of

staff members but would not spontaneously greet anyone. He occasionally (three times per week) initiated physical contact with staff members by tickling them, scratching their backs or touching their hands.

Dan functioned at the severe to moderate level of mental retardation. Psychometric evaluations indicated I.Q. scores that ranged between 30 and 55.

Setting

The investigation was conducted at a large suburban high school. A series of probe conditions were designed to observe the acquisition and generalization of social skills in a natural school setting.

Probe setting. Generalization probes were conducted in an outdoor courtyard (15 x 25m). Adjoining the special education classroom were three regular education classes. The courtyard contained four benches which were placed around a central planter. During regularly scheduled breaktimes, 8 handicapped and approximately 35 nonhandicapped students would gather in the courtyard.

The breaktime was unstructured for both groups of students. The nonhandicapped students in the courtyard represented a typical cross-section of the students attending the high school. Freshman, sophomores, juniors and seniors were present in equal proportions. Typically, the nonhandicapped students would spend their breaktime by "hanging out," e.g., stand in small groups, converse and smoke cigarettes.

The autistic students had been attending classes at the high school for two years prior to the study. The nonhandicapped

students tended to pay little attention to either the self-stimulatory behavior or the social isolation behavior of the autistic students. If an autistic student did approach a group of nonhandicapped students, he was often greeted and welcomed into the group. Instances of ridicule or abuse were rare. Since the autistic and nonhandicapped students had been on the same campus for several years, some nonhandicapped students had learned the names of the autistic students and would greet them. Other nonhandicapped students in the setting had previously served as peer tutors in the autistic classroom. Thus, the composition of students who took their breaks in the courtyard consisted of those who had no previous experience interacting with autistic students (unfamiliar peers) as well as those who either served as peer tutors (peer tutors) in the past or had made an effort to interact with the autistic students on their own (familiar peers). The nonhandicapped students were completely blind to the experimental conditions and were not aware of the purpose of the data collection. The peer tutors in the breaktime setting were not involved in social skill training at any time.

Two generalization probe times were utilized, corresponding to two scheduled morning breaks. The generalization probes lasted for 15 min. A break lasting from 10:05 to 10:20 a.m. (time 1) was used from Tuesday to Friday for all phases of the study. In addition to the 10:05 breaktime, an additional break (time 2, 11:00 to 11:15 a.m.) was added during the social skill training phases. One or two observers stood in the courtyard, holding a stopwatch, and a pen concealed in the front pocket of a sweatshirt in order to make data recordings. Because of the large number of

persons present in the courtyard during probe times the observers were able to remain unobtrusive and unnoticed.

Training settings. Training was conducted in both the generalization setting and the special education classroom. Training in the generalization setting occurred at different times than during the morning breaktimes. When training sessions occurred in the generalization setting, no nonhandicapped peers were present other than the peer trainers.

The special education classroom was 6 x 8m in size and contained a freetime break area (2 x 3m) where training sessions also took place. The break area had a sofa, rug, phonograph and a bookshelf containing a variety of games, magazines and records. The number of training sessions were evenly divided between the classroom setting and the courtyard setting.

Conditions

The participants were exposed to a sequence of five experimental conditions. The sequence of conditions was designed to layer in three components of extended social interactions in addition to providing a natural baseline condition.

For each of the conditions, generalization probes were run in the courtyard to evaluate the effect of the treatment. The condition probes occurred on the same days in which training occurred. The two baseline probes involved no training at another time of the day. Rather, the student was probed with or without possession of the leisure objects (see below). The three training probes all had the student carry an object. The type of object carried was randomly varied from session to session. After the

initial no-object baseline condition, no-object probes were intermittently run through the remainder of the experiment.

No object baseline. The participants were first exposed to a natural baseline condition where they circulated throughout the courtyard during the morning break. The participants carried no special objects and were given no instructions during the probes. The measures were begun when the participating special education teacher gave the cue "take a break" and the participants entered the courtyard.

Object-only condition. The participants were sent to the courtyard for the breaktime probe with one of three objects and the same instructions to go take a break. The objects were selected because of their potential reinforcement value during interactions between autistic and nonhandicapped students. The students were given no instructions on how to operate the objects or how to socially interact with them. The condition served as an evaluation of the mere presence of attractive objects on social interaction.

The first object was a hand-held, video game called Pacman. Video games were popular among nonhandicapped students in this high school setting. The game could be learned by autistic persons and the hand-held version is portable so it could be used in a variety of breaktime settings.

The second object was a SONY Walkman FM radio equipped with a pair of stereo headphones. Many teenagers wore the headphones for listening to popular music both on and off the high school campus.

The third object was a pack of chewing gum. Gum was selected because it was noted that it was often used in the midst of a

conversation to reinforce the other person and further established the intimacy of the interaction. Thus, the gum was portable and served as a potential reinforcer for the nonhandicapped student during the interaction. All three objects were selected because of their ability to reinforce nonhandicapped students during their interactions with autistic students. The objects also impacted on three different sensory modalities: visual (Pacman), auditory (Walkman), and gustatory (gum). The objects required little or no verbal discourse during an interaction and were thus suited to the communicative abilities characteristic of the autistic population.

Object function training. The object function training condition taught the participants to successfully manipulate the object. The participant was again sent out for the generalization probe with a particular object and the instructions to go and take a break. At another time of the day, though, he received one or two training sessions in the appropriate use of the object. The trainer met individually with the student and taught him how to: play Pacman, tune in and operate the Walkman radio and open and chew one piece of gum at a time without swallowing it when finished. The sessions consisted of five consecutive trials. The behavioral steps for performing each object activity were task analyzed and appear in Table 1. It can be noticed that the use of the object was taught as an isolated task and no related social skills were part of the task analysis. Each task was taught with a concurrent or total task training procedure (cf., Bellamy et al., 1979; Gaylord-Ross, Note 1). The trainer presented a cue to: "play Pacman," "listen to the radio" or "chew the gum." The student was expected to complete all of the behaviors in the task

analysis in their proper sequence. Correct responses were positively reinforced with verbal praise. When there were five consecutive correct responses of a behavioral step, contingent reinforcement was dropped for that step. An error consisted of no response, a partial response, an incorrect response or a response out of sequence. Errors led to the immediate verbal and physical prompting of the correct response. Prompted responses were not reinforced.

Insert Table 1 about here

Training sessions began with one object. When the student reached 80% performance on one object, a second object was included during training sessions. The training trials then alternated between the two objects. Criterion was reached when the student attained three consecutive trials with no errors. The object was then no longer included in the training sessions. Mike was sequentially trained in Walkman, Pacman and gum. Dan's order of training was Pacman, Walkman and gum. The purpose of the object training condition was to investigate the effects of acquiring competence at manipulating an object on subsequent social interactions.

Social skill training. After the student had learned to appropriately manipulate the object, a social skill training condition was established to teach the social skills that would permit the autistic person to initiate and engage in social interactions with these objects with his nonhandicapped peers. Social exchanges may be analyzed into initiation, elaboration and termination phases. This training condition first taught the

autistic student to approach a peer and make a greeting response. Next, the student offers to play with the object with his peer. If the peer responds affirmatively, they engage the object in a reciprocal fashion. Finally, a termination or farewell response is made to signal the end of the interaction.

Table 2 presents the task analyses of the three social skill training programs. The students received one or two training sessions per day. The sessions lasted about five min. Sessions were scheduled at least 15 min. prior to conducting generalization probe measures. Six trials were run in each session. However, the first trial in each session was conducted as a "retention" probe. That is, no prompts, corrections or praise were given on the first trial. All training trials began with the cue to "take a break." After the initial cue was presented the student had to produce each response in the chain in an accurate fashion. Correct responses were verbally reinforced and errors were verbally and physically prompted to produce responses in the correct sequence. The criterion for acquisition of the social responses was 100% correct for two consecutive sessions.

Insert Table 2 about here

In the training sessions, the social interactions were prompted between the autistic student and a nonhandicapped peer. The trainer was present to prompt and reinforce the exchanges. The peers used in training were selected on the the basis of a conceptual model to promote stimulus generalization. The CASE model developed by Horner (Horner, Sprague & Wilcox, 1982)

utilizes a simultaneous training strategy (Stokes & Baer, 1977) to promote generalization. The student is exposed to multiple exemplars of a stimulus (in this case, nonhandicapped, adolescent peers). The training exemplars should contain the range of critical attributes present in the stimulus conditions where generalization is to take place. In this case, the training peers were in the tenth, eleventh or twelfth grade (age variation). They were either known or unfamiliar to the autistic student (variation across the familiarity dimension). The participant was exposed to six peer trainers (two male and four female) who were rotated across the social skill training sessions. The peer trainers were never present during generalization probes. During a given session only one peer tutor was employed.

Before the first training session the peer was presented with a verbal and written description of the training procedure. The peer was shown a script of how he or she was to respond to the social behaviors of the autistic student (see Table 3). The trainer and the peer role-played the exchange prior to the first training session. The trainer thereafter monitored peer and autistic student behavior. Peers learned their scripts fairly easily and there was no need for extra training.

Insert Table 3 about here

Maintenance. Four months after training conditions were terminated the participants were again handed an object and given the cue to take a break. As during the object only baseline, the participants were given no instruction or prompts on how to

operate these objects or how to interact with the nonhandicapped students. In other words, aside from the passage of four months wihout any training, the maintenance probes did not differ from the generalization probes.

Measurement

During the 15 min probe period an observer recorded a number of social behaviors. The observer was familiar to the regular and special education students in the courtyard. The observer stood at least 5m away from the participants during the probe sessions. Mike and Dan were observed simultaneously. Only social events enacted between the participants and the nonhandicapped peers were recorded. Three classes of dependent variables were recorded during the generalization probes.

Social initiation. A social initiation was defined as one student approaching within one m of another student, orienting their body toward the other person and making a verbal or gestural response which would indicate purposeful communication, e.g., exchanging an object, conversing or touching one another. Initiation behaviors which did not lead to an acknowledgement from the other person were not scored as social initiations, since a response without some acknowledgement by another person cannot be considered a social behavior. Acknowledgement behaviors included verbal replies, gestural replies, handling objects, changes in head or body orientation or making eye contact with the social initiator. Behaviors that appeared to be self-stimulatory or non-communicative were not scored as social initiations. Social initiations were coded as either "autistic student initiations" or "nonhandicapped student initiations" depending on which student

initiated the interaction. The total number of autistic and nonhandicapped student initiations were separately tallied for each participant at the end of the probe session to produce four frequency scores.

Duration. Whenever an interaction was initiated, the observer started a stopwatch. The stopwatch was turned off at the end of the interaction. An interaction ended whenever the targeted participant or the nonhandicapped student shifted attention to another person or moved 1.5m away from the interacting student. The observer carried two stopwatches in case the participants were having simultaneous interactions; although this never happened. At the end of the interaction the observer recorded the duration and type of social initiation that had occurred. The number of seconds of interaction was summed at the end of a session to produce a duration score for each participant.

Descriptive information. A variety of descriptive information was recorded in addition to the initiation and duration data. Whenever an interaction occurred, the observer recorded the name of the nonhandicapped peer who took part in the social exchange. The nonhandicapped peer was categorized as a peer tutor (however, not a peer used during social training), a familiar peer or a nonfamiliar peer. The observer also noted whether the interaction was centered around any object. Object-centered interactions were defined as social events which involved the offering and exchange of the video game, Walkman or gum. Non-object-centered interactions were defined as social interactions involving verbal exchanges of information, requests

for food, or other responses not directly trained within the study.

Reliability. A second observer performed reliability checks in the generalization probe setting. Four individuals who were graduate students in special education served as reliability observers. The observers were trained to use the instrument by scoring social behaviors in a similar breaktime setting prior to participation in the study. The second observer stood unobtrusively in the courtyard at least 5m away from the primary observer. There were two to four checks in each probe condition. At a minimum, reliability probe sessions were scheduled immediately before and after changes were made in the experimental conditions. Agreement was evaluated on a point-by-point basis (Kazdin, 1982, p. 54). That is, the agreement or disagreement concerning the occurrence of a social behavior was determined for every discrete social event. For example, when observer 1 saw Dan wave hello to a specific nonhandicapped peer at 2 min 3 sec into the session and observer 2 recorded the same event at that time, that was an agreement. If observer 1 recorded that event at that time but observer 2 did not, that was a disagreement. The formula used to calculate the average agreements was:

$$\text{point-by-point agreement} = \frac{A}{A + D} \times 100$$

where A = # agreements that a social event occurred

B = # disagreements that a social event occurred

Calculations of interobserver agreement using the point-by-point agreement formula are considered to be appropriate when behavior

occurs at a low frequency because with low frequency behaviors the probability of "chance" agreements are negligible.

The reliability of the duration data collected during the generalization probes was calculated with the ratio formula described by Kazdin (1982, p. 52):

$$\% \text{ agreement} = \frac{\text{smaller \#SEC}}{\text{larger \#SEC}} \times 100$$

The percent agreement was calculated for each instance of a social event. For instance, if observer 1 saw Dan wave to a specific peer at a given time for 10 sec and the second observer recorded the duration of that event to be 5 sec, the event agreement would be 50%. Then, the mean of the precentage agreements of events across a session was calculated. Events in which both observers did not agree on their occurrence were not included in these calculations. Summary data are reported in Table 4. Reliability coefficients were obtained in 34% of the generalization probes for Mike and in 39% of the generalization probe sessions for Dan.

Insert Table 4 about here

The reliability of the training data was assessed with nine reliability checks for each participant. The method and formula for evaluating the reliability of the training data was the same as that used to evaluate the frequency of interaction data collected during the generalization probes. The percentage agreement coefficients attained during the training sessions appear in Table 4.

Design

A multiple baseline design across stimuli was utilized to demonstrate the functional control of the social skill training package over the participant's acquisition of the approach, initiation, exchange and termination responses. Baseline probes, conducted within the training setting, were taken across all three objects. The trainer handed the participant the object and gave the cue to take a break. The nonhandicapped teenager, pretrained with the script from Table 4, was seated in the courtyard reading a magazine. The trainer recorded the number of responses from the task analysis (Table 3) for the particular object that the autistic student displayed. Upon entering the courtyard setting the trainer watched from a distance of 8m and recorded all correct responses whether in sequence or not. The trainer offered no prompts or reinforcers during baseline. After a sufficient number of baseline sessions indicated that few of the social behaviors were spontaneously produced by the participant, social skill training with each of the three objects was sequentially lagged in. Performance was measured by tallying the number of correct responses in each trial as per baseline measures.

The generalization probes were lagged in sequentially as training proceded with successive objects. First, a series of no object baselines were run. Again, at later phases of the experiment no-object probes were intermittently presented in order to evaluate whether social responding would occur in the autistic youth without possessing the trained object. After the initial no-object baseline a series of object baseline probes were run to evaluate the effect of possessing the object without knowing how

to use it. Next, a series of object probes were run after object function training began. Finally, following social skills training, object probes at times 1 and 2 were alternated across sessions. There was some overlap between object baseline probes and object function probes for the following reason. When object function training began with Pacman, for instance, subsequent probes with Pacman were labeled object function but gum and Walkman were still in the object-only baseline, since no training had begun with these objects. Subsequently, when object function training began with Walkman, probes with Walkman (and Pacman) were labeled object function while yet-to-be-trained gum probes were still object-only baseline. Finally, gum was trained and all probes were object function. The same overlapping of object function and social skill probes occurred when the objects were sequentially added during social skill training.

Results

The effectiveness of the social skill training package is demonstrated in Figure 1. The percentage of correct responses for Dan in the social skill analyses for the maintenance probe trials is plotted in the baseline and training conditions. The profile of Mike's acquisition of the social behaviors across the three objects was nearly identical to Dan's but is not graphically displayed here. Both Dan and Mike displayed steady baseline levels of performance that ranged between 5% and 50%. This nonzero level reflects the skills that they had already learned in manipulating the objects in the object training condition. In baseline there was still an absence of the social skills enumerated in the task analyses. When social skill training was

introduced there was an immediate and substantial increase in performance in the retention trials across all three objects for both students. Figure 1 shows how training and retention trial performance stabilized at the 80%-100% level. It can be inferred that the social skill training package was responsible for the acquisition of the approach, greeting, distance maintenance, and termination responses in both Dan and Mike.

Insert Figure 1 about here

An analysis was made of the generalization of social skills during the unstructured breaktime. Figure 2 presents the cumulative number of AI responses by Dan across generalization probe sessions. Baseline (no object) probes produced no responses throughout the study. The 16 sessions of the object-alone condition produced only one self-initiated response. Similarly, during the 18 probes of object training only one initiation response was observed. Next, the social skills training did produce a substantial amount of generalized responding. There was a total of 16 responses in 17 sessions. In the last condition of the experiment, it was decided to run additional generalization probes at a second break time. The six "time 2" probes (vs. the 10 a.m., "time 1" probes) resulted in 15 responses across six sessions. Therefore, the rate of responding in time 2 probes was about three responses per session, which exceeded the time 1 rate by three fold.

Insert Figure 2 about here

The generalization of AI responses for Mike also appears in Figure 2. Again, there was no responding during initial baseline sessions. Interestingly, generalized responding did occur in the first two no-object probes that were taken later during the social skill training phase. Thus, when Mike learned social approach, elaboration and termination behaviors with objects, he generalized them to circumstances when he carried no objects. In contrast to Dan, Mike did emit some AI behaviors in the object-only baseline and object training conditions. The rate of responding was low, though; four responses per session in the object-only baseline condition and eight responses per session in object training. The social skills (time 1) training probes showed a substantial amount of AI responding (two initiations per session). The time 2 probes also produced a rate of two initiations per session. As with Dan, a substantial rate of generalized responding occurred only after Mike had attained criterion in the social skills training sessions.

A further analysis was conducted on the duration of AI interactions and the type of object used in these occurrences. Figure 3 shows that the only substantial duration of responding (in cumulative number of sec) for Dan was with the Pacman and Walkman objects. All of these probe sessions occurred during social skill training except for one object training probe with Walkman. The duration of the generalized responding which occurred with gum was shorter in comparison.

Dan's data included all AI interactions that were centered around the interactive object and those that were not. In Dan's case, almost all interactions were object centered so that the

graphs for all AI interactions (Figure 3) versus object-centered only interactions would be nearly identical. In contrast, Mike's interactions differed between the total AI interactions and those initiated only around the trained object.

Insert Figure 3 about here

Figure 4 shows that for Mike, in the Walkman probes, substantial social initiation did not occur until social skill training was begun. However, only about half of the total AI interactions were centered around the object. This is consistent with Mike's AI data in the no-object, baseline probes of social skill training (see Figure 3). There, AI responses appeared in the absence of the trained objects. Similarly, the data from Pacman shows that none of the AI interactions were centered around the object. Yet, the other social behaviors trained like approaching, posturing and greeting appeared in the generalization probes. The gum object produced consistent but short duration interactions that were object centered.

Insert Figure 4 about here

An analysis was completed concerning who the autistic students initiated toward. It was found that through the entire study Dan initiated interactions with peer tutors 20 times, familiar, non-peer tutors 19 times and unfamiliar students on 14 occasions. Mike initiated interactions with peer tutors 29 times, familiar, non-peer tutors 30 times and unfamiliar students 14 times. Throughout the study Dan initiated interactions with 28

nonhandicapped students and Mike interacted with 33 nonhandicapped students. Thus, Dan and Mike tended to select familiar students to interact with. This data was not controlled, though, and must be interpreted with caution. Students who were familiar tended to spend more time in the courtyard and were, therefore, more available to interact with. Also, there was no control put on the number or proportion of familiar and unfamiliar students in the courtyard at a given time.

Interactions initiated by the nonhandicapped students were separately analyzed. With Mike, the nonhandicapped peers initiated interactions with the following means (number of interactions per session): no object baseline = .67, object only baseline = .71, function training = 1.2 and social skill training = 1.5. Thus, when comparing the social skill training data to the initial no object baseline data, Mike was approached more than twice as frequently after he was trained to manipulate and offer the objects. Dan's data produced a contrasting pattern of results. During the no-object baseline condition, Dan received a mean of .11 initiations by the nonhandicapped students. A mean of 1.8 was observed during the object-only baseline condition, 1.5 during function training and .88 during social skill training. Although Dan became somewhat less "popular" as the conditions were progressively layered in, he was eight times more likely to be approached during the final condition of the study than he was during the initial, no object baseline condition. To summarize, both participants received substantially more initiations from the nonhandicapped students after they were trained to manipulate the objects and initiate social interactions with them. Throughout

the study, nonhandicapped students initiated social interactions on 85 occasions with Mike and on 41 occasions with Dan.

Finally, a series of maintenance probes were run with Dan and Mike four months after the cessation of training. The probes were run in the same courtyard setting at breaktimes for 15 min periods with the Walkman object. On two probes Dan initiated one interaction for 222 sec and one interaction for 316 sec. In one probe Mike initiated no interactions.

Discussion

Experiment 1 demonstrated that social skill sequences with differing objects can be successfully taught to autistic youth. Furthermore, when a variety of persons (training exemplars) are used, there can be a considerable amount of generalized responding in nontraining contexts. The success of the social skills training package was highlighted by the consistent functional relationship of bringing a student to training criterion and there being an immediate increase in generalized responding. The consistency of effects across objects and students further supported the efficacy of the training package. Dan and Mike did learn to approach and interact with nonhandicapped students at the rate of one to three interactions per break. In addition, during the interactions that lasted one to three min, even when the interactions were not object centered (e.g., Mike - Pacman), the student emitted pertinent social behaviors to sustain an interaction.

The social validity of the behavior change could be inferred by examining the frequency of initiations by the nonhandicapped students. The NH initiation data for Mike and Dan indicated that, compared to object baselines, considerably more initiations

occurred when the objects, object function and social skill training conditions were introduced. Although these data do not indicate how the students "felt" about the interactions, they do indicate that the autistic students were perceived as more desirable to interact with as a function of the intervention.

In addition, it should be pointed out that the objects themselves were initially selected because of their interest to the nonhandicapped students. That is, before the study began observations were made of the NH students at the high school and it was found that many of them listened to Walkman radios and shared food during breaks from classes, as well as playing video games at off-campus arcades.

Finally, it is possible that the experimental design of gradually layering in object training and social skill training after baseline may have inhibited generalization. The participants may have developed a pattern of not responding in the probe setting because they had extensive experience manipulating the objects during the object-only baseline prior to any social interaction intervention. In fact, higher frequencies of generalized initiation were observed during the second generalization probe time where the participants had not undergone repeated sessions of nonresponding.

EXPERIMENT 2

A second experiment was designed to replicate the effects of the training package with another autistic student. In addition, the experimental design and treatment package were altered to control for the problem of repeated baseline measures. Also, the object training phase was combined with social skill training.

Experiment 1 showed that object training had little influence on the social aspects of social skill training. From a practical point of view, teachers are more likely to teach the social and object manipulation behaviors at the same time.

Method

Participant

Jim was an 18-year-old student who attended the same special education class as the participants in Experiment 1. He was diagnosed autistic by an agency independent from the staff conducting the study. He displayed a number of self-stimulatory behaviors on a daily basis that included body rocking, hand waving, grimacing and twirling fingers in front of his face. Jim would voluntarily speak to request food items. He could follow two-step commands and had a receptive vocabulary of about 200 words. He could successfully work on a task for 20-30 min. He would greet familiar persons by putting his hand out to gesture hello. He would not spontaneously say "hi" to others. Jim would approach familiar persons at times and place his face a few cm from the face of the other person. After a couple of sec of this behavior he would often run away from the person with a gleeful laugh. In most social situations Jim would isolate himself. When he was in proximity to others he rarely oriented his body in a proper frontal manner; he rarely gave eye contact.

Procedure

Separate generalization and training sessions were conducted. Training sessions occurred in both the courtyard and classroom settings. Training sessions were separated by at least one hour from generalization probes. Jim was trained to manipulate and

socially initiate with three objects; a hand-held "Galaxian" video game, a Sony Walkman with two stereo headphones and gum. The order of exposure to the objects was gum, Walkman and Galaxian. All probes and training sessions were begun with the cue "go take a break."

Generalization data were collected using the same response definitions as in Experiment 1. The probes were taken daily at lunchtime and lasted for 15 min. Previous to training a series of no-object baseline probes were run. During training no-object and object probes were run in alternating fashion. Toward the end of the condition only object probes were presented. A total of 12 reliability checks were made across the baseline and training conditions. Interobserver agreement was calculated in the same manner as in Experiment 1. The percentage of agreement for the frequency of autistic initiations and frequency of nonhandicapped initiations was 100% on all checks. The range of the percentage agreement scores for the duration data was 92% to 100% with a median of 96%. There was 100% agreement for who the interactants were and whether the interaction was object-centered or not.

Design

This study used a multiple baseline design across the three objects for training with concurrent generalization probes. Jim was first exposed to a baseline condition in the classroom and courtyard settings. He was given an object and a cue to take a break. The trainer then counted the number of responses from the task analysis for each object that Jim produced regardless of their order of appearance. No prompts or reinforcers were given.

Approximately half of the training sessions were conducted in the special education classroom and half in the courtyard. During all training sessions one nonhandicapped female peer was present within 5m of Jim. The same peer served in the experiment on a daily basis so that only one person (exemplar) was used in Experiment 2. As before, the peer was pretrained using a script of possible social responses. The script for Walkman and gum were identical to that in Experiment 1. The script for Galaxian was identical to the script for Pacman in Experiment 1 (see Table 4 and insert Galaxian for Pacman). Following baseline, social skill training was sequentially introduced in a multiple baseline fashion. As in Experiment 1, each training session began with an unprompted and nonreinforced retention trial.

The gum and Walkman social skills training were identical to that in Experiment 1 (see Table 3). A different video game, Galaxian, was used in this experiment. Table 3 presents the task analysis of this game. The same prompting and reinforcing procedures used in Experiment 1 were applied to teach these three tasks. The only difference between experiments was that the manipulation of the objects was taught with the social skills.

Reliability data on the social skills training were collected in the same manner as in Experiment 1. There were 10 reliability checks on the accuracy of scoring the steps in the task analyses. Interobserver agreement was 100% on all checks.

Results and Discussion

Jim successfully learned the social skill sequences for the three objects. He sustained about a 10-20% correct level of responding in the baseline trials. In the training condition his

training and retention trial performance gradually increased to the 90-100% level. The profile of acquisition of the social behaviors across the three objects was similar to Figure 1.

Jim displayed a substantial rate of generalized social (AI) responding (see Figure 5). During the no-object baseline condition there were no initiation responses. When the training package was introduced, generalized responding both with the objects and without the objects (baseline probe) was observed. The duration of the interactions was also substantial. Figure 6 shows the cumulative number of sec of interaction across training conditions and object type. There was much interaction with Galaxian and gum. There was little interaction in the initial baseline and Walkman. Interestingly, no-object (baseline) probes run after social skill training had been instituted produced a frequency of initiating social interactions (1.14 per break) which was similar to the frequency produced when Jim had objects (1.06). Thus, Jim was interacting with his handicapped peers (approaching, speaking) even when he did not carry a breaktime object. The mean duration of the no-object probes during the social training condition was 11.2 seconds. Similarly, when Jim was probed with gum, he rarely used the gum to initiate social behaviors as he would usually consume the gum himself. Instead, as in the no-object probes, Jim approached, greeted and positioned himself in proximity to peers and, at times, conversed with his peers. His mean duration of interaction was 27.4 sec/session with gum, 14.5 sec/session with the Walkman and 155.6 sec/session with the Galaxian video game.

Insert Figures 5 and 6 about here

Like the students in Experiment 1, Jim tended to interact with students who were familiar to him. Across all sessions he had the following number of interactions: peer tutor = 29, familiar, non-peer tutor = 10, unfamiliar peer = 2. Again, these results must be interpreted with caution because of the lack of control of the peers in the courtyard setting.

In contrast to Experiment 1, there were systematic differences in the nature of the interactions initiated by nonhandicapped peers. There was little time spent interacting in the baseline probes (both initial or extended). Figure 6 shows that there was a substantial amount of time in NI object probes after training had been instituted. The interactions were object-centered for Walkman and Galaxian but not for gum. For example, peers approached Jim and they initiated an interaction by requesting to see the radio or videogame. The peers approached him when he had gum but no sharing of the object occurred. Yet, social interactions transpired (greetings, conversation).

Finally, a maintenance probe lasting 15 min that used the Walkman object was run in the courtyard four months after the completion of training. Jim initiated one interaction (which lasted 46 sec) in the session.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Persons referred to as autistic are characterized by their socially withdrawn style of behavior. The three youth in these experiments had spent from one to three years in a highly "integrated" school setting where they had substantial daily

contact with nonhandicapped peers. In spite of this contact the autistic students initiated essentially no interactions with their peers before a training procedure was instituted. The absence of social interaction between handicapped and nonhandicapped students prior to training is in agreement with previous work on this topic (cf., Guralnick, 1978).

In order to encourage social interaction with their peers the autistic students were given objects which were appealing to their nonhandicapped peers and that required little or no verbal explanation. It was found that in a free play setting the mere possession of the attractive object or separate training in how to use it did not lead to social initiations and interactions by the autistic students. It was necessary to train the students in the related social skills of greeting, positioning, etc., before they began to initiate and sustain interactions with their peers.

The training procedure proved quite successful in teaching the acquisition of social skill sequences. Within the training context the youth initiated and sustained interactions with a variety of persons and play objects. Attention should be given, though, to the types of students with which this procedure could be used. Participants were functioning at the severe and moderate levels of retardation. They were capable of learning the multiple-step social sequences in a rapid and simultaneous fashion. Students with more profound handicapping conditions may have cognitive disabilities that would limit their learning of the social sequences in the manner presented here. The sequence may have to be taught in a slower, serial manner rather than with the total task, concurrent procedure used here. Also, the video games

like Pacman and Galaxian may require too much cognitive processing for students with lesser intellectual abilities.

The most impressive finding in the study was that there was a considerable amount of social responding by the participants during the unstructured breaks. The autistic youth were initiating interactions with nonhandicapped peers at a rate of one to three encounters in a 15-min break period. The interactions also lasted for a substantial duration (.5 to 3 min) and were centered either around the play objects or other pro-social activities like simple conversation. The successful training of longer duration encounters extends previous work that taught brief greeting responses to retarded and autistic persons (Haring, 1978; Stokes et at., 1974).

Part of the success of the generalization training procedure may be due to the use of multiple training exemplars (persons). In training, the autistic youth was exposed to different nonhandicapped peers across trials. This simultaneous training (Stokes & Baer, 1977) or systematic variation of persons led the student to generalize his social responses to other peers in the probe setting. Previous work which failed to produce generalization of social behavior among autistic persons has used a single exemplar training approach, i.e., one autistic student with one nonhandicapped student. Yet, our conclusion must be qualified since multiple person training occurred only in Experiment 1 but not in Experiment 2. In Experiment 2 there was successful generalization with Jim being exposed to the same peer throughout training. Part of Jim's success with a single training peer was that he was considerably "higher functioning" than the

participants in Experiment 1. He had more social and language skills prior to the onset of the study than Mike or Dan. Thus, single-person training might have been sufficient to produce generalization given his social and cognitive abilities. We do not, of course, know whether single-person training would have been successful with Mike and Dan since they were only exposed to the multiple exemplar case. Certainly, future research should investigate the number of training persons necessary for the generalization of social behaviors among autistic persons.

It should be remembered that the generalization of social behaviors in the present study was across persons (and time) but not settings. The probe setting was in the same courtyard at different times of the day. Within this setting the autistic youths tended to approach and interact with familiar peers. These were peers with whom they did not receive social skills training but students who spent considerable time in the special education classroom and/or the probe courtyard. The tendency to interact with familiar peers may explain the inconsistency in the maintenance data. Two out of three of the participants showed maintenance of the social interaction skills four months after training. Four months had elapsed because training was terminated at the onset of summer vacation. The maintenance probes were taken the following fall. As a consequence, many of the familiar peers from the year before were not present in the fall. Therefore, the failure of Mike to demonstrate maintenance of the social skills could be due to forgetting the skills in the summer or to changes in the population of nonhandicapped people in the courtyard.

In terms of social validity it is important to identify the types of settings and persons that are targeted for stimulus generalization. In the social behavior domain, it is not desirable to have handicapped persons approach any person in all settings in order to socially interact. Unwanted outcomes could accrue from such overly generalized response tendencies. Rather, it is more appropriate for individuals to, by and large, interact with familiar persons in familiar settings. In the present study the autistic youths did approach familiar peers in a given familiar settings. Future educational and research efforts should give attention to the types of settings or subenvironments in which social responding is to occur. In a person's typical day there are contacts with familiar persons in familiar settings, e.g., the corner newsstand. the "ma and pa" store. Within these subenvironments it is appropriate to initiate social contacts. In more transient settings, like public restrooms, it is generally not advisable to approach unfamiliar persons. It can be seen that a comprehensive understanding of the socialization of autistic persons will include a delineation of the subenvironments where social behaviors are promoted (generalized) and a designation of those settings where generalized social responding should not take place (Haring & Baldwin, Note 2). When describing these social subenvironments it is important to keep abreast of what is fashionable and of interest to the nonhandicapped peer group. Video games and radios were used here as vehicles to promote extended interactions. With other age groups or with changing fads the types of play objects used may differ. The key factor is that objects should be selected that are likely to be reinforcing

to both the handicapped and nonhandicapped person. If the reinforcement preferences of the nonhandicapped peer are not considered, there is little likelihood that this individual will sustain interactions in a generalization setting where no external reinforcers are delivered by a teacher or therapist for interacting with a handicapped person.

When considering the dyadic nature of social interaction it should be remembered that the present study only focused on the training of the handicapped youth to be an initiator and sustainer of interactions. Some previous work has lodged all of the training efforts with the nonhandicapped peer (for a review of this work, see Strain, 1981). It would, of course, be possible to have a training package that intervened with both members of the dyad (cf., Baldwin, 1983). Future research should investigate the different member components of a social skills training package that will maximize a natural reciprocity of social exchanges (Piaget, 1951). Also, the role of the object in facilitating social interaction should be studied. Quilitch and Risley (1973) found that certain types of objects facilitated cooperative play and others led to isolate play. Here, certain objects led to longer duration interactions than others. It was assumed that the object served as a social "prosthetic" to faciliate interaction among peers who ordinarily had no common language or cultural base to build interactions around. While the play objects served this function, there were other instances where non-object-centered interactions seemed to evolve from the social behaviors that had been learned by the autistic youth. For instance, Jim emitted social responses in the no-object probe after he received social

skill training. He also emitted social responses in object probes that did not revolve around the object, e.g., greeting, approaching, conversing, but not playing Galaxian. Similarly, Mike emitted many social behaviors in object probes that did not center around the play object. Dan differed in this regard in making almost all of his social responses object centered in the probes. Thus, the individual differences in social behavior across youth could be due to endogenous differences in cognitive or social development or some characteristic of the treatment package. At present it can be stated that the social skills training package successfully produced generalized responding but it is not clear whether the play objects were essential in producing this effect. In conclusion, the relation between object, training and related variables appears to be a fertile ground for future research to investigate the most effective ways to promote the social development of autistic persons.

Reference Note

1. Gaylord-Ross, R.J. Task analysis and the severely handicapped. Unpublished manuscript, San Francisco State University, 1981.

2. Haring, T.G., & Baldwin, M. Some current issues in socialization training and research of severely handicapped students. Manuscript in preparation, San Francisco State University.

References

Baldwin, M. Established reciprocity within play activities in severely handicapped students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California - Berkeley/San Francisco State University, 1983.

Bellamy, G.T., Horner, R.H., & Inman, D.P. Vocational habilitation of severely retarded adults. Baltimore: University Park, 1979.

Egel, A.L., Richman, G.S., & Koegel, R.L. Normal peer models and autistic children's learning. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1981, 14, 3-12.

Guralnick, M. (Ed.) Early intervention and the integration of handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Baltimore: University Park, 1978.

Haring, T.G. The training and generalization of greeting response behaviors to severely emotionally disturbed pupils. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kansas, 1978.

Hendrickson, J.M., Strain P.S., Tremblay, A., & Shores, R.E. Relationshi between toy and material use and the occurrence of social interactive behaviors by normally developing preschool children. Psychology in the Schools, 1981, 18, 500-504.

Horner, R.H., Sprague, J., & Wilcox, B. Constructing general case programs for community activities. In B. Wilcox & G.T. Bellamy (Eds.), Design of high school programs for severely handicapped students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, 1982.

Kazdin, A.E. Single-case research designs: Methods for clinical and applied settings. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Koegel, R.L., & Covert, A. The relationship of self-stimulation and learning in autistic children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1972, 5, 381-388.

Koegel, R.L., & Rincover, A. Treatment of psychotic children in a classroom environment: I. Learning in a large group. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1974, 7, 45-59.

Lovaas, O.J. The autistic child: Language development through behavior modification. New York: Irvington, 1977.

Piaget, J. Plays, dreams and imitation in childhood. New York: Norton, 1951.

Quilitch, H.R., & Risley, T.R. The effects of play materials on social play. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1973, 6, 573-578.

Ragland, E.U., Kerr, M.M., & Strain, P.S. Effects of social initiations on the behavior of withdrawn autistic children. Behavior Modification, 1978, 2, 565-578.

Schreibman, L., Koegel, R.L., & Craig, M.S. Reducing stimulus overselectivity in autistic children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 1977, 5, 425-436.

Stokes, T.R., & Baer, D.M. An implicit technology of generalization. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1977, 10, 349-367.

Stokes, T.R., Baer, D.M., & Jackson, R.L. Programming the generalization of a greeting response in four retarded children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1974, 7, 599-610.

Strain, P.S., & Fox, J.J. Peer social initiations and the modification of social withdrawal: a review and future perspective. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 1981, 6, 417-433.

Strain, P.S., Kerr, M.M., & Ragland, E.U. Effects of peer-mediated social initiations and prompting/reinforcement procedures on the social behavior of autistic children. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 1979, 9, 41-54.

Strain, P.S., Shores, R.E., & Timm, M.A. Effects of peer social initiations on the behavior of withdrawn preschool children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1977, 10, 289-298.

Table 1

Task Analyses for Object Training

Pacman

1. Turn on machine.
2. Press start.
3. Make Pacman move down.
4. Change direction at wall.
5. Run away from ghost.
6. Read score.
7. Turn game off.

Walkman

1. Turn on radio.
2. Adjust volume control to level 6.
3. Put headphones on.
4. Select rock station.
5. Change station at the beginning or end of a song.
6. Change station at a commercial.
7. Turn off radio and remove headphones.

Gum

1. Take stick of gum out of pocket.
2. Unwrap gum.
3. Put gum in mouth.
4. Chew for 15 sec without swallowing. Successively increase time criterion to: 30 sec., 1 min., and 3 min.
5. Throw gum away into a receptacle.

Table 2

Task Analyses for Social Skills Training

Pacman

1. AS approaches NS.[a]
2. AS establishes one m proximity.
3. AS establishes a face-forward orientation.
4. AS says "hi."
5. AS waits for response.
6. AS says "want to play?"
7. AS waits for response. AS finds someone else if NS does not indicate willingness to play. AS then begins sequence at step 1 again.
8. AS turns game on.
9. AS hands game to NS.
10. AS watches NS play.
11. AS receives game from NS.
12. AS reads NS score.
13. AS turns game off.
14. AS turns game on to reset score to zero.
15. AS plays game (see steps for playing Pacman in Table 2).
16. AS reads own score.
17. AS offers game to NS. If NS accepts, play continues in alternating fashion. When NS indicates s/he is finished, AS takes game back.
18. AS says "bye."

Walkman

1. As approaches NS.
2. As establishes one m proximity.
3. AS establishes face forward orientation with NS.
4. AS says "hi."
5. AS waits for response.
6. AS says (and writes[b]) "wants to listen."
7. AS shows radio to NS.
   a. If NS not interested in interacting, AS approaches another student (step 1).
8. AS turns on radio.
9. AS adjusts volume to level 6.
10. AS hands headphones to NS.
11. AS puts on headphones.
12. AS selects rock and roll station.
13. AS remains in proximity to NS until termination of interaction by NS.
14. AS says "bye."

Table 2
(continued)

Gum

1. AS approaches NS.
2. AS establishes one m proximity.
3. AS establishes a face-forward orientation.
4. AS says "hi" to NS.
5. AS waits for a response.
6. AS says (and writes[b]) "what are you doing?"
7. As waits for a response.
8. AS says (and writes[b]) "want some gum?" and shows pack of gum.
9. If NS says yes, AS hands pack of gum of NS.
10. NS hands pack back to AS.
11. AS selects a stick of gum and chews it until the end of the interaction.
12. As remains in one m proximity to NS for at least 30 sec or until end of interaction.
13. As says "bye" when NS terminates the interaction.

Galaxian

1. AS approaches NS.
2. AS establishes one m proximity.
3. AS establishes face-forward orientation to NS
4. AS says "hi."
5. AS waits for a response.
6. AS writes and says "want to play."
7. AS shows message and game to NS.
8. If NS indicates no, AS goes to another student (step 1).
9. AS turns on game.
10. AS hands game to NS.
11. AS looks at game for 10 out of every 15 sec NS is playing.
12. AS receives game from NS.
13. AS says NS score.
14. AS turns game off.
15. AS turns game on.
16. AS depresses right directional dial with right hand.
17. AS repeatedly depresses fire button with left hand.
18. AS depresses left directional dial with right hand.
19. AS reads own score at end of game.
20. AS offers game to NS. Steps 11-20 continue if NS indicates interest in playing.
21. AS says "bye" when NS ends interaction.

[a]AS = autistic student, NS = nonhandicapped student.
[b]Applies only to Jim, who would write on a notebook the words he was saying and display the notebook to the NS.

Table 3

Training Scripts for Nonhandicapped Peer and Autistic Student

Autistic Student[1]	Nonhandicapped Peer[2]
Pacman	
1. "Hi."	
	2. "Hi, _____, how are you doing?"
3. "Fine."	
4. "Want to play Pacman?"	
	5a. "Sure (yeah, great)" or b. "No, thanks."
6. Turns on game.	
7. Hands game to NP.	
	8. Plays game until it is over.
	9. Hands game to AS.
10. Reads score.	
11. Turns game off and then on and plays.	
	12. Watches while AS plays; encourages him when AS plays well.
13. Reads his own score at the end of the game.	
14. Offers game to NP.	
	15. Plays game or says "No, thanks, got to go, bye."
16. Says "bye."	
Walkman	
1. "Hi."	
	2. "Hi, how are you?"
3. "Fine."	
4. "Want to listen?"	
	5a. "Sure." or b. "No, thanks."
6. Turns on Walkman.	
7. Sets volume to 6.	
8. Hands headphones to NP.	
	9. Puts headphones on.
10. Turns to rock 'n roll station.	
	11. Listens or tells students to change station and then listens
	12. Gives headphones back to AS and says "bye."
13. "Bye."	

Table 3
(continued)

Autistic Student	Nonhandicapped Peer
Gum	
1. "Hi."	
	2. "Hi."
3. "What are you doing?"	
	4. "Just sitting around, (not much, waiting for someone)."
5. "Want some gum?"	
	6. "Sure (yeah)."
7. Hands stick to NP.	
	8. Takes stick of gum and says "thanks."
9. "Sure."	
10. Chews gum.	
	11. Talks to student. Asks him "What did you to yesterday? What are you doing after school?.."
12. Responds to questions from NP.	
	13. Hangs out for one to three min.
	14. "Bye."
15. "Bye."	

[1]AS = Autistic Student.

[2]NP = Nonhandicapped Peer.

Table 4

Interobserver Agreement for Training and Generalization Sessions

	Student	Number of Checks	Range	Median	Mean
Frequency of Interaction (generalization)	Dan	15	50-100%	100%	93%
	Mike	17	50-100%	100%	97%
Duration of Interaction (generalization)	Dan	15	61-100%	98%	94%
	Mike	17	35-100%	85%	84%
Behavioral Steps (training)	Dan	10	all 100%	100%	100%
	Mike	12	all 100%	100%	100%

Figure Captions

Figure 1. The percentage of responses completed in the task analyses of social interaction behaviors for Dan.

Figure 2. The cumulative numbers of social initiations for Dan and Mike in the four probe conditions.

Figure 3. The cumulative sec of autistic initiated interactions with each object for Dan.

Figure 4. The cumulative sec of autistic initiated interactions with each object for Mike.

Figure 5. The cumulative number of social interactions for Jim.

Figure 6. The cumulative number of sec of autistic initiated and nonhandicapped peer initiated interactions with each object for Jim.


Dan
Baseline
Social Skill Training
Percentage of Correct Responses
PacMan
Walkman
Gum
100
75
50
25
0
5
10
15
20
25
30
35
Sessions
□ - Retention (unprompted, nonreinforced probe)
● - Training


Dan
o-o ~ No object baseline
x-x ~ Object baseline
O-O ~ Function of object training
Δ-Δ ~ Social Skill Training: Time 1
□-□ ~ Social Skill Training: Time 2
20
10
0
Mike
40
30
20
10
0
Cumulative Number Autistic Initiations
10
20
30
40
50
60
Consecutive Sessions

DAN


Cumulative Seconds of Interaction
1400
1200
1000
800
600
400
200
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
Sessions
No object baseline
Pacman
Walkman
Gum
Object only B.L.
Object Function training
Social training
Object only B.L.
Object Function training
Social training
Object only B.L.
Object Function training
Social training


MIKE
Total Autistic Initiated Interactions
800
600
400
200
0
No object baseline
Walkman
Pacman
Gum
Object only B.L.
Object Function training
Social training
Object only B.L.
Object Function training
Social training
Object only B.L.
Object Function training
Social training
Cumulative Seconds of Interaction
Object Centered Autistic Initiated Interactions
400
200
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
Sessions


Jim
Cumulative Number Autistic Initiations
40
30
20
10
0
No object B.L.
Social skill & object function training
10
20
30
40
50
60
Consecutive Sessions
Baseline (no object probe)
Probes with objects

JIM
Cumulative Seconds of Interaction
1400
1200
1000
800
600
400
200
0
NO OBJECT BASELINE
BASELINE PROBE: GUM
SOCIAL & FUNCTION TRAINING WITH GUM
BASELINE PROBES; WALKMAN
SOCIAL & FUNCTION TRAINING WITH WALKMAN
BASELINE PROBES; GALAXIAN
SOCIAL & FUNCTION TRAINING WITH GALAXIAN
10
20
30
40
Sessions
Initiated by Autistic Student
Initiated by Nonhandicapped Students